

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			TORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/300,510	09/02/94	GEFTER		M 0	92.0US
 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLF		HM31/0305	コ	EXAMINER CUNNINGHAM, T	
28 STATE STR					
BOSTON MA 02	2109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1644	
				DATE MAIL ED.	03/05/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Advisory Action

Application No. 08/300,510 Applicant(s)

Gefter et al.

Examiner

Thomas Cunningham

Group Art Unit

1644



тн	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]					
• • •	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
	b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.					
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.					
X	ppellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on <u>Jun 12, 1997</u> (or within any eriod for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).					
Ap bu	pplicant's response to the final rejection, filed on has been considered with the following effect, it is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:					
X	The proposed amendment(s):					
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.					
	X will not be entered because:					
	$oxed{X}$ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).					
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).					
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.					
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
	NOTE: <u>The proposed amendment of claim 106 does not raise new issues. The proposed amendment of claim 133</u>					
	raises new issues with respect to use of "without adjuvant" instead of "in nonimmunogenic form".					
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):					
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.					
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):						
	Claims allowed: None					
	Claims objected to: None					
	Claims rejected: 103-144					
	The proposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Exami					
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)					
X	Other The amendment of claim 133 would also affect interpretation of the generic claims from which it depends and raise additional considerations.					
	THOMAS CUNNINGHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1644					

Application No. 08/300,510 Art Unit 1644

NOTICE OF DEFECTIVE APPEAL BRIEF

The brief does not include a statement that claims 103-144 do not stand or fall together, however, pages 6-10 "Grouping of Claims" appear to argue or present reasons why such claims do not stand or fall together, see both "Grouping of Claims" section and "Argument" section which has arguments directed to different claim limitations. In the absence of a statement that the claims do not stand or fall together, the Board will presume that all claims stand or fall together, see MPEP 1206. Where the Appellant omits the statement required by 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(7) yet presents arguments in the "Argument" section of the Brief that different claims may stand or fall independently, the Examiner must notify the Appellant of noncompliance as per 37 C.F.R. 1.192(d), see MPEP 1206.

The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal, which refers to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(5). The invention examined pursuant to the election of species requirement is directed to methods and products comprising a peptide from the Fel D1 allergen. Pages 3-5 "Summary of the Invention" of the Appeal Brief are not directed to the invention as it reads on the elected species. Appellant is required to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c).

The brief does not contain an accurate statement of the status of an amendment filed subsequent

Application No. 08/300,510

Art Unit 1644

to the final rejection as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(4). The amendment filed 12/12/97 has not

been entered as it would raise new issues or require additional consideration after final rejection.

Further limitation of claim 133 to "without adjuvant" raises specific enablement issues with regard

to methods or compositions not containing an adjuvant. By inference it raises additional issues

with regard to the broader claims from which claim 133 depends, i.e. what effect, if any, the lack

of an adjuvant (or the presence of one), would have.

Applicant is given a TIME LIMIT OF ONE MONTH from the date of this letter or any time

remaining in the period under 37 CFR 1.192(a) for filing a new complete brief. If a new brief that

fully complies with 37 CFR 1.192© is not timely submitted, the appeal will be dismissed as of the

date of expiration of the period provided by 37 CFR 1.192(a). NO EXTENSION OF THIS ONE

MONTH TIME LIMIT MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER EITHER 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) but the

original TWO-MONTH period under 37 CFR 1.192(a) for filing the brief may be extended under

37 CFR 1.136(a) up to SIX MONTHS from the date of the notice of appeal.

THOMAS M. CUNNINGHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER **GROUP 1800**